

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS
Mobridge-Pollock School District
Accountability Review - Monitoring Report 2012-2013**

Team Members: Chris Sargent, Team Leader, Joan Ray, Roxanne Uttermark, Education Specialists, Wendy Jarvis, Beth Shultz Special Education Programs

Dates of On Site Visit: February 5th and 6th, 2013

Date of Report: February 15, 2013

All non-compliance must be corrected within 1 year of this report date.

Date Closed:

Program monitoring and evaluation.

In conjunction with its general supervisory responsibility under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Part B, Special Education Programs (SEP) of the Division of Educational Services and Support shall monitor agencies, institutions, and organizations responsible for carrying out special education programs in the state, including any obligations imposed on those agencies, institutions, and organizations. The department shall ensure:

- (1) That the requirements of this article are carried out;
- (2) That each educational program for children with disabilities administered within the state, including each program administered by any other state or local agency, but not including elementary schools and secondary schools for Native American children operated or funded by the Secretary of the Interior:
 - (a) Is under the general supervision of the persons responsible for educational programs for children with disabilities in the department; and
 - (b) Meets the educational standards of the state education agency, including the requirements of this article; and
- (3) In carrying out this article with respect to homeless children, the requirements of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, as amended to January 1, 2007, are met. (Reference- ARSD 24:05:20:18.)

State monitoring--Quantifiable indicators and priority areas.

The department shall monitor school districts using quantifiable indicators in each of the following priority areas, and using such qualitative indicators as are needed to adequately measure performance in those areas:

- (1) Provision of Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment;
 - (2) Department exercise of general supervision, including child find, effective monitoring, the use of resolution meetings, mediation, and a system of transition services as defined in this article and article 24:14; and
 - (3) Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services, to the extent the representation is the result of inappropriate identification. (Reference-ARSD 24:05:20:18:02.)
-

State enforcement -- Determinations.

On an annual basis, based on local district performance data, information obtained through monitoring visits, and other information available, the department shall determine whether each school district meets the requirements and purposes of Part B of the IDEA...

Based upon the information obtained through monitoring visits, and any other public information made available, Special Education Programs of the Division of Educational Services and Support determines if the agency, institution, or organization responsible for carrying out special education programs in the state:

- Meets the requirements and purposes of Part B of the Act;
- Needs assistance in implementing the requirements of Part B of the Act’
- Needs intervention in implementing the requirements of Part B of the Act; or
- Needs substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of Part B of the Act. (Reference-ARSD 24:05:20:23.04.)

Deficiency correction procedures.

The department shall require local education agencies to correct deficiencies in program operations that are identified through monitoring as soon as possible, but not later than one year from written identification of the deficiency. The department shall order agencies to take corrective actions and to submit a plan for achieving and documenting full compliance. (Reference-ARSD 24:05:20:20.)

GENERAL SUPERVISION / STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN COMPLIANCE INDICATOR

ARSD 24:05:30:05. Content of notice. The notice must include the following:

- (1) A description of the action proposed or refused by the district, an explanation of why the district proposes or refuses to take the action, and a description of any other options the IEP team considered and the reasons why those options were rejected;
- (2) A description of each evaluation procedure, assessment, record, or report that the district uses as a basis for the proposal or refusal;
- (3) A description of any other factors which are relevant to the district's proposal or refusal;
- (4) A statement that the parents of a child with a disability have protection under the procedural safeguards of this article and, if this notice is not an initial referral for evaluation, the means by which a copy of a description of the procedural safeguards can be obtained; and
- (5) Sources for parents to contact to obtain assistance in understanding the provisions of this article.

ARSD 24:05:25:06. Reevaluations. A school district shall ensure that a reevaluation of each child with a disability is conducted in accordance with this chapter if the school district determines that the educational or related service needs, including improved academic achievement and functional performance, of the child warrant a reevaluation or if the child's parents or teacher requests a reevaluation.

A reevaluation conducted under this section may occur not more than once a year, unless the parent and district agree otherwise, and must occur at least once every three years, unless the parent and the district agree that a reevaluation is unnecessary.

Corrective Action:

Prong 1: Correct each individual case of noncompliance		
Timeline for Completion: 45 calendars day from the report date listed above.		
Student:	Required Action:	Data To Be Submitted:
Student #1 was reported on child count under the	Data was available in the student record to support the	Refer to Prong #2

category of Other Health Impaired (555). The prior notice/consent did not inform parents that chronic/acute health documentation would be considered to determine eligibility under this category. The eligibility document omitted this information for determining Prong #1 of eligibility also.	diagnosis of ADHD used for determining eligibility under this category. Refer to Prong #2 to verify the prior notice/consent and the eligibility document are completed correctly in the future.	
Date Data Submitted: Refer to Prong #2		

Prong 1: Correct each individual case of noncompliance Timeline for Completion: N/A Refer to Prong #2 timeline.		
Student:	Required Action:	Data To Be Submitted:
Student #2 was reported on child count under the category of Other Health Impaired (555). The eligibility document did not inform parent that chronic/acute health documentation would be considered to determine eligibility under this category.	Data was available in the student record to support the diagnosis of ADHD used for determining eligibility under this category. Refer to Prong #2 to verify the eligibility document is completed correctly in the future.	Refer to Prong #2
Date Data Submitted: Refer to Prong #2		

Student:	Required Action:	Data To Be Submitted:
Students # 2 and 5: The 3 year reevaluation timeline was exceeded for these students.	The timeline cannot be corrected. Refer to Prong #2 to verify the 3 year timeline is met for future reevaluations.	Refer to Prong #2.
Date Data Submitted: Refer to Prong #2.		

Prong 2: Correctly implement the specific regulatory requirements (i.e. achieved 100% compliance), based on the SEA's review of updated data.		
The district must submit a copy of the prior notice/consent and the eligibility document for the next student re-evaluated and determined eligible under the Other Health Impaired category (555). The district must also submit a copy of the cover page from the previous eligibility document for the student reevaluated above.		
Target Date for Completion: On or before November 1, 2013		
Date - Status Report:		

State Performance Plan – Performance Indicators

Indicator 3: Participation and Performance on Statewide Assessments: Participation and performance of children with disabilities on Statewide Assessments.

C) Did the district meet the proficiency target for the subgroup of students with disabilities in the statewide assessment?

Math

Grades K –8

State Target 76% or higher

District Rate: 21.43

District Response: We have changed materials that we are using as well as size of groups for instruction. We also will be changing the schedule for testing.

Indicator 8: Parent involvement: percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. (L = Response rate less than 15% of December 1, 2008 child count)

State Target 64.20 or higher

District Rate: 89.5

District Response: We have changed how we hand out surveys. In the past they were all sent out at once. Now they are handed out at each IEP meeting.